



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,514	06/08/2000	Allan Herrod	4842.0068-01	1287

7590 01/14/2002

Finnegan Henderson Farabow
Garrett and Dunner LLP
1300 I Street NW
Washington, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

FRANKLIN, JAMARA ALZAIDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/589,514

Applicant(s)

HERROD ET AL.

Examiner

Jamara A. Franklin

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 45-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 45-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 June 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 and 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment is made of the receipt of the preliminary amendments received on 6/8/00. Claims 45-57 are currently pending.

Continuing Domestic Data

Acknowledgment is made that this application is a division of Application Serial No. 08/827,263, now pending.

Drawings

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 56 recites the limitation "said applications" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2876

5. Claim 57 recites the limitation "said application" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate clarification and correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claims 45-50 and 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cragun et al. (US 5,804,803) (hereinafter referred to as 'Cragun').

Cragun teaches a client computer 102 (fig. 1A) including a display screen 114, a scanning device 118 for reading a code 117 into a bar code input buffer 109 and a processing program 110 for converting code 117 in buffer 109 into a URL in a URL output buffer 111. The URL is

Art Unit: 2876

ultimately sent to network 148 via local server computer 122 through wireless network device 120 (col. 5, lines 53-58).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cragun in view of Swift et al. (US 6,053,413) (hereinafter referred to as 'Swift').

The teachings of Cragun have been discussed above.

Cragun lacks the teaching of the scanner comprising one of the group of a "flying spot" optical scanner or a "field of view" optical scanner.

Swift teaches a field of view scanner having full internet connectivity (col. 9, lines 3-10).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that a field of view scanner is one type of a variety of optical scanners that may be selected for use depending upon the preferred operative light source. In this case, the field of view scanner may be preferred because the proper scanning distance needed to decode a bar code is assured. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Cragun with the field of view scanner as taught by Swift.

11. Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cragun in view of Williams et al. (US 5,815,657) (hereinafter referred to as 'Williams'). The teachings of Cragun have been discussed above.

Cragun lacks the teaching of instructions comprising applets.

Williams teaches programming for Internet in the form of applets (col. 10, lines 9-21).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that applets segment the entire programming instructional language in a manner that makes execution of the program less time-consuming. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Cragun with the programming applets as taught by Williams.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Collins, Jr. et al. (US 5,221,832) teach a raster variation method for omnidirectional optical scanners.

Art Unit: 2876

Russell et al. (US 5,905,248) teach a system and method for carrying out information-related transactions using web documents embodying transaction enabling applets automatically launched and executed in response to reading URL-encoded symbols pointing thereto.

Miya (JP 2001154965 A) teaches a system for inputting and outputting barcode of internet address.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamara A. Franklin whose telephone number is (703) 305-0128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Jamara A. Franklin
Examiner
Art Unit 2876

JAF
January 8, 2002



KARL D. FRECH
PRIMARY EXAMINER